

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR * | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/542,178 | 07/08/2005 | C. David Allis | 00856-03 | 4003 |
| • | 2,178 07/08/2005 C. David Allis 7590 06/19/2007 VERSITY OF VIRGINIA PATENT FOUNDATION | EXAMINER | | |
| 250 WEST MAIN STREET, SUITE 300 | | | SZPERKA, MICHAEL EDWARD | |
| CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22902 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1644 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE , | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/19/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 10/542,178 | ALLIS ET AL. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Michael Szperka | 1644 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appearing for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | NATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | <u>_</u> . | | | | |
| ,_ | | | | | |
| | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under the | Ex paπe Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4: | 53 O.G. 213. | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | • | | | |
| 4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or | wn from consideration. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11. | cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is object. | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received tu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | ate | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/542,178 Page 2

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are pending in the instant application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-4, drawn to antibodies that bind ePAD.

Group II, claims 5-9, drawn to methods of identifying ePAD antagonists.

Group III, claims 10-13, drawn to methods of decreasing female fertility.

Group IV, claims 14 and 15, drawn to ePAD nucleic acids and host cells.

Group V, claims 16-18, drawn to methods of screening for therapeutic agents.

Group VI, claims 19-21, drawn to ePAD polypeptides.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-VI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature that links the instant inventions is ePAD proteins. The prior art of Herr et al. (WO 01/53339, of record on the IDS received 3/31/06, discloses an ePAD (egg peptidylarginine deiminase) named MOP5 (see entire document, particularly page 9). See also lines 3-8 of page 3 of the instant specification which discusses the '339 patent document. As such the technical feature that links applicant's claimed inventions does not make a contribution over the teachings of the prior art and thus the instant inventions have been found to lack unity of invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/542,178 Page 3

Art Unit: 1644

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

- 4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process Art Unit: 1644

claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Szperka whose telephone number is 571-272-2934. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael Szperka, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1600

May 25, 2007